



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,602	03/18/2004	Aaron S. Filner	13768.783.110	9554
47973 7590 07/18/2007 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER PESIN, BORIS M	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,602

Applicant(s)

FILNER ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 5/1/2007.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

In the amendment filed 5/1/2007, Claims 1, 6 and 9 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 2005/0195221 A1 (hereinafter Berger) in view of Herigstad et al. (US 2004/0174400).

As per claim 1, Berger discloses of a mobile computing device having limited display capabilities, a method for displaying a full readable content page despite the

limited display capabilities of the mobile device, the method comprising: "dividing content into regions" by dividing a raster image or document into segments or regions (Berger page 2 [0012] lines 6-10); "displaying a plurality of the regions together as a thumbnail and in a reduced size on a display of a mobile computing device" by producing a raster image that is segmented and in a smaller size (Berger page 4 [0051] lines 1-6); "detecting a request to display a selected one of the regions" by a user demarcating regions for display on a display (Berger page 3 [0021] lines 3-12); "replacing the thumbnail on the display by displaying the selected region in a size that is expanded relative to the reduced size" by displaying an expanded version (Figure 14B object 1404) of the selected region on a panel adjacent to the panel consisting of the reduced version (Figure 14B object 1402) as shown by Figure 14B (Berger Figure 14B).

Berger does not teach, for the displayed selected region, detecting a request to display a second region; in response to detecting the request to display the second region, temporarily displaying the thumbnail on the display, the temporarily displayed thumbnail highlighting the newly selected second region; and after temporarily displaying the thumbnail following selection of the second region, displaying the second region on the display. Herigstad teaches, detecting a request to display a second region (See Figure 4b Element 80); in response to detecting the request to display the second region, temporarily displaying the thumbnail on the display, the temporarily displayed thumbnail highlighting the newly selected second region (See Figure 4b Element 82); and after temporarily displaying the thumbnail following selection of the

Art Unit: 2174

second region, displaying the second region on the display (See Figure 4C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Berger with the teachings of Herigstad and include a method to display more regions on the screen in order to allow the user to get greater detail in accessing certain information, like a map.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "providing a navigation grid having a plurality of regions which can each be navigated to via navigation commands" by superimposing a grid onto a raster image and having user interface mechanisms to areas of the grid as user desires (Berger page 6 [0061] lines 8-18 and page 7 [0069] lines 1-5).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "panelizing the content into panelized regions" by creating panels in a display (Berger page 12 [0108] lines 3-6).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "providing a tooltip that is based on the content of a region that is being displayed in the reduced size" by having unique labels for the segments in the display (Berger page 2 [0017] lines 6-10).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "scaling the selected region such that its content can be viewed by scrolling in only one

Art Unit: 2174

dimension" by eliminating the requirement of scrolling to one direction (Berger page 4 [0049] lines 1-2).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "detecting a request to display a second region comprises scrolling in a second dimension, wherein scrolling in a second dimension is indicative of a request to change the displayed region from the previously selected region to another region" by scrolling to a new segment and displaying the adjacent segment (Berger page 2 [0015] lines 20-26).

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "providing a visual indication of the change of regions" by distinguishing a selected segment with symbol overlays, region highlighting, region coloring, region border highlighting, etc. (Berger page 2 [0014] lines 6-12).

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "scrolling in the one dimension beyond a limit in the region changes the displayed region from the previously selected region to another region" by changing the display to the next segment if scrolling has gone beyond the previous segment's border (Berger page 2 [0015] lines 20-26).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 9 contains the same limitations as claim 7 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 7.

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "providing a cursor that indicates which region will be selected as the selected region upon detecting the request to display one of the regions" by having cursor available to select the segments of the page (Berger page 5 [0055] lines 6-13).

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "the cursor is provided as a grid framing marker" by supplying a user interface mechanism, which constitutes the cursor, a way to modify the grid (Berger page 7 [0069] lines 5-11).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "providing the cursor comprises marking a border around a panelized region" by distinguishing a region with symbol overlays, region highlighting, region coloring, region border highlighting, etc. (Berger page 2 [0014] lines 6-12).

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "scaling the regions such that the regions can be viewed by scrolling in only one

Art Unit: 2174

dimension" by reformatting the size so that scrolling in one direction is not required (Berger page 4 [0049] lines 1-2 and page12 [0107] lines 1-3).

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "receiving the content as a web page" by receiving a web page, document, or other content (Berger page 4 [0050] lines 10-13).

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "scrolling within the selected region" by allowing the capability of scrolling in a selected segment (Berger page 2 [0015] lines 20-26).

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and Berger discloses of "jumping between two links based on a single directional command" by jumping to another segment by clicking or identifying a new location (Berger page 14 [0120] lines 1-4, 7-10 and page 14 [0123] lines 1-11).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2174

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100